RG104 E-1 Box 146

223,	gold	.246	silver	.544
227,	"	.390	"	.420
236,	"	.109½	"	.687
247,	"	.177½	"	.458
249,	"	.244	"	.575
261,	"	.141½	"	.598
265,	"	.144	"	.594
279,	"	.379	"	.427
280,	"	.395	"	.405
285,	"	.107	"	.685
296,	"	.123	"	.639
314,	"	.306½	"	.527
315,	"	.287½	"	.470
316,	"	.131½	"	.656
324,	"	.251	"	.606
325,	"	.399½	"	.504
326,	"	.100½	"	.716
329,	"	.324	"	.446
338,	"	.050	"	.761
347,	"	.149½	"	.630
359,	"	.160	"	.776
363,	"	.143	"	.687
364,	"	.174	"	.696
365,	"	.248½	"	.419
366,	"	.147½	"	.651
379,	"	.337½	"	.462
386,	"	.141	"	.565
389,	"	.035	"	.793
390,	"	.078	"	.610
394,	"	.331½	"	.442
397,	"	.230	"	.520
399,	"	.062½	"	.738
400,	"	.056	"	.484
406,	"	.334	"	.420
407,	gold	.233	silver	.395
412,	"	.277½	"	.512
420,	"	.231½	"	.482
425,	"	.168½	"	.607
433,	"	.293	"	.431
438,	"	.279	"	.431
439,	"	.184	"	.598
442,	"	.138	"	.692
450,	"	.239	"	.503
463,	"	.071½	"	.742
464,	"	.240	"	.520
467,	"	.303½	"	.556
474,	"	.335	"	.431
481,	"	.192½	"	.587
487,	"	.294	"	.354
493,	"	.351½	"	.444
496,	"	.229	"	.253
498,	"	.395½	"	.422
499,	"	.057½	"	.672
500,	"	.309	"	.447
504,	"	.327	"	.341
522,	"	.157½	"	.636
545 545,	"	.080	"	.681
546,	"	.079½	"	.781
549,	"	.419½	"	.498
560,	"	.208	"	.534
561,	"	.110	"	.666
570,	"	.312½	"	.576
572,	"	.221	"	.577
575,	"	.023	"	.825
578,	"	.236½	"	.445
581,	"	.348½	"	.487
586,	"	.048½	"	.817
589,	"	.333½	"	.458

I can readily understand how it might be difficult, in the case of some deposits, to tell readily before assay whether the

RG104 E-1 Box 146

deposit should be classed as a gold or silver deposit, but in many of these cases you will notice that the silver was largely in excess. Take for instance, No. 575, where the gold was only .023 and silver .825; and No. 586, where the gold was only .048½ and the silver .817. In these deposits it must have been evident to a practiced eye that the silver predominated.

Of course it makes very little practical difference to the Department whether the deposits are entered as gold or silver or whether the classification between the two classes is strictly observed, at an institution which is purchasing silver. The rule in regard to the receipt of deposits as gold deposits in which the silver predominates in fineness originally entered at the small assay offices, and at the mints where ~~the~~ silver is not being purchased for the silver dollar coinage, but even at your mint there would be a difference between the rate paid for the silver contained in these deposits as partings, and the silver contained in them if they had been treated as silver purchases; but, at any rate, it is important that a strict classification, as far as practicable, between deposits as to their character, whether gold or silver, should be observed as required by the regulations, and I call attention to these

RG104 E-1 Box 146

numerous deposits more for the sake of instituting a more accurate classification at your mint, than with the intention of attaching any blame to the entries referred to.

Very respectfully,

Geo. E. Roberts

Director of the Mint.

Hon. Daniel M. Fox,

Superintendent, U.S. Mint,

Philadelphia, Pa.

RG104 E-1 Box 146

827

Treasury Dept.
Washington, D.C.
June 20. 1887

James P. Kimball.
Director.

Calls attention to the method of classifying of Gold & Silver deposits, as entered in the Bullion accts of the first quarter ended March 31. 1887, and requests that more care be used.

RECEIVED
JUN 21 1887
U.S. MINT, PHILA.

NARA RG104, Entry 1, Box 146

[Please note: page one is missing from the original document.]
[Abstract:] Calls attention to the method of classifying of Gold & Silver deposits…

2- D.M.F.

223, gold	.246 silver	.544	407, gold	.233 silver	.395
227, “	.390 “	.420	412, “	.277 ½ “	.512
236, “	.109 ½ “	.687	420, “	.231 ½ “	.482
247, “	.177 ½ “	.458	425, “	.168 ½ “	.607
249, “	.244 “	.575	433, “	.293 “	.431
261, “	.141 ½ “	.598	438, “	.279 “	.431
265, “	.144 “	.594	439, “	.184 “	.598
279, “	.379 “	.427	442, “	.138 “	.692
280, “	.395 “	.405	450, “	.239 “	.503
285, “	.107 “	.685	463, “	.071 ½ “	.742
296, “	.123 “	.639	464, “	.240 “	.520
314, “	.306 ½ “	.527	467, “	.303 ½ “	.556
315, “	.287 ½ “	.470	474, “	.335 “	.431
316, “	.131 ½ “	.656	481, “	.192 ½ “	.587
324, “	.251 “	.606	487, “	.294 “	.354
325, “	.399 ½ “	.504	493, “	.351 ½ “	.444
326, “	.100 ½ “	.716	496, “	.229 “	.253
329, “	.324 “	.446	498, “	.395 ½ “	.422
338, “	.050 “	.761	499, “	.057 ½ “	.672
347, “	.149 ½ “	.630	500, “	.309 “	.447
359, “	.160 “	.776	504, “	.327 “	.341
363, “	.143 “	.687	522, “	.157 ½ “	.636
364, “	.174 “	.696	545, “	.080 “	.681
365, “	.248 ½ “	.419	546, “	.079 ½ “	.781
366, “	.147 ½ “	.651	549, “	.419 ½ “	.498
379, “	.337 ½ “	.462	560, “	.208 “	.534
386, “	.141 “	.565	561, “	.110 “	.666
389, “	.035 “	.793	570, “	.312 ½ “	.576
390, “	.078 “	.610	572, “	.221 “	.577
394, “	.331 ½ “	.442	575, “	.023 “	.825
397, “	.230 “	.520	578, “	.236 ½ “	.445
399, “	.062 ½ “	.738	581, “	.348 ½ “	.487
400. “	.056 “	.484	586, “	.048 ½ “	.817
406, “	.334 “	.420	589, “	.333 ½ “	.458

I can readily understand how it might be difficult, in the case of some deposits, to tell readily before assay whether the deposit should be classed as a gold or silver deposit, but in many of these cases you will notice that the silver was largely in excess. Take for instance, No. 575, where the gold was only .023 and silver .825; and No. 586, where the gold was only .048 ½ and the silver .817. In these deposits it must have been evident to a practiced eye that the silver predominated.

Of course it makes very little practical difference to the Department whether the deposits are entered as gold or silver or whether the classification between the two classes is strictly observed, at an institution which is purchasing silver. The rule in regard to the receipt of deposits as gold deposits in which the silver predominates in fineness is rightly enforced at the small assay offices, and at the mints where silver is not being purchased for the silver dollar coinage, but even at your mint there would be a difference between the rate paid for the silver contained in these deposits as partings, and the silver contained in them if they had been treated as silver purchase; but, at any rate, it is important that a strict classification, as far as practicable, between deposits as to their character, whether gold or silver, should be observed as required by the regulations, and I call attention to these numerous deposits more for the sake of instituting a more accurate classification at your mint, than with the intention of attaching any blame to the entries referred to.

Very respectfully,
Jas. P. Kimball
Director of the Mint.

Hon. Daniel M. Fox,
Superintendent, U.S. Mint,
Philadelphia, Pa.